

# PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

## PCT

### INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY (Chapter I of the Patent Cooperation Treaty)

(PCT Rule 44bis)

Applicant's or agent's file reference N 10040 PCT	<b>FOR FURTHER ACTION</b>		See item 4 below
International application No. PCT/EP2005/001252	International filing date ( <i>day/month/year</i> ) 08 February 2005 (08.02.2005)	Priority date ( <i>day/month/year</i> ) 09 February 2004 (09.02.2004)	
International Patent Classification (8th edition unless older edition indicated) See relevant information in Form PCT/ISA/237			
Applicant NOXXON PHARMA AG			

1. This international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) is issued by the International Bureau on behalf of the International Searching Authority under Rule 44 bis.1(a).

2. This REPORT consists of a total of 10 sheets, including this cover sheet.

In the attached sheets, any reference to the written opinion of the International Searching Authority should be read as a reference to the international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) instead.

3. This report contains indications relating to the following items:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. I	Basis of the report
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. II	Priority
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. III	Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. IV	Lack of unity of invention
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VI	Certain documents cited
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VII	Certain defects in the international application
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VIII	Certain observations on the international application

4. The International Bureau will communicate this report to designated Offices in accordance with Rules 44bis.3(c) and 93bis.1 but not, except where the applicant makes an express request under Article 23(2), before the expiration of 30 months from the priority date (Rule 44bis .2).

Date of issuance of this report 03 October 2006 (03.10.2006)
---

The International Bureau of WIPO 34, chemin des Colombettes 1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland
---

Facsimile No. +41 22 338 82 70

Authorized officer

Agnes Wittmann-Regis

e-mail: pt06@wipo.int

# PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

To:

**PCT**

## WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

		Date of mailing (day/month/year) <b>See form PCT/ISA/210</b>
Applicant's or agent's file reference <b>N 10040 PCT</b>		<b>FOR FURTHER ACTION</b> See paragraph 2 below
International application No. <b>PCT/EP2005/001252</b>	International filing date (day/month/year) <b>08.02.2005</b>	Priority date (day/month/year) <b>09.02.2004</b>
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC <b>A61K47/48</b>		
Applicant <b>NOXXON PHARMA AG</b>		

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- Box No. II Priority
- Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. **FURTHER ACTION**

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA/EP	Authorized officer
Facsimile No.	Telephone No.

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.  
PCT/EP2005/001252

**Box No. I**

**Basis of this opinion**

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.  
 This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language \_\_\_\_\_, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rule 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
  - a. type of material  
 a sequence listing  
 table(s) related to the sequence listing
  - b. format of material  
 in written format  
 in computer readable form
  - c. time of filing/furnishing  
 contained in the international application as filed.  
 filed together with the international application in computer readable form.  
 furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3.  In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table(s) relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.  
PCT/EP2005/001252

Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability

The questions whether the claimed invention appears to be novel, to involve an inventive step (to be non obvious), or to be industrially applicable have not been examined in respect of:

the entire international application

claims Nos. 1-23

because:

the said international application, or the said claims Nos. \_\_\_\_\_ relate to the following subject matter which does not require an international preliminary examination (*specify*):

See supplemental sheet

the description, claims or drawings (*indicate particular elements below*) or said claims Nos. \_\_\_\_\_ are so unclear that no meaningful opinion could be formed (*specify*):

the claims, or said claims Nos. \_\_\_\_\_ are so inadequately supported by the description that no meaningful opinion could be formed.

no international search report has been established for said claims Nos. 1-23

the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing does not comply with the standard provided for in Annex C of the Administrative Instructions in that:

the written form

has not been furnished

does not comply with the standard

the computer readable form

has not been furnished

does not comply with the standard

the tables related to the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing, if in computer readable form only, do not comply with the technical requirements provided for in Annex C-bis of the Administrative Instructions.

See Supplemental Box for further details.

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.  
PCT/EP2005/001252

**Supplemental Box**

Use of this unconventional parameter in the present context leads to a lack of clarity. The definition of the products within the scope of protection of the claim is unclear because the parameter cannot be determined unambiguously and reliably with the information given in the application or by objective methods conventional in the art. Comparison of the claimed subject matter with the prior art is thus impossible. For this reason, the claim does not meet the clarity requirements of PCT Article 6.

No written opinion is provided for parts of the application for which there has been no search (PCT Rule 66.1(e)).